

AIR

PATCH 1-3

EGMA-12627

CLASSIFICATION

27 Sept 54

Chief, EE

DATE

Chief of Mission, Frankfurt

INFO: COM

Operational/CART

Hungarian Military Circles-in-exile

Reference EGMA-12115, 10 August 1954

1. Attached are four reports by [redacted] (Source 300) on recent developments and controversies in Hungarian military circles-in-exile. Attachment A from General Gustav HENRIEY (Subsource 302) gives his further views on the significance of the March alliance between Generals Andreas ZAKO and Ferdinand PARKAS and his reaction to an article which has been published in Hungary alleging that HENRIEY knew of the secret Hungarian capitulation negotiations in 1944 with the Soviet Union. Attachment B from Dr. Zoltan MAKRA (Subsource 303) editor of Hungary, and supporter of ZAKO and PARKAS, defends the ZAKO-PARKAS alliance and the newly (July) created "Hungarian National Defense Council". MAKRA also states he was directly behind the article aimed at HENRIEY. Attachments C and D are, in effect, interviews with Generals PARKAS (Subsource 314) and ZAKO (Subsource 310) respectively in which they expound the aims of their agreement. Of interest is PARKAS' statement that while the formation of the "Hungarian Defense Council" makes "very probable" the disbandment of the Kameradschaftsverband Ungarischer Frontkämpfer (KUF) of his newly-found partner ZAKO, PARKAS' own Ungarische Befreiungsbewegung (USB) will in no circumstance be disbanded.

2. Paragraph 3 of Attachment A is the result of [redacted] attempt to induce HENRIEY to amplify his previous statements that ZAKO recently went to work for the Bundesamt fuer Verfassungsschutz (BfV) and succeeded in placing several of his people in the OEHLEN organization (cf. EGMA-12115). As will be seen, [redacted] was not overly successful. HENRIEY here confirms that it is ZAKO whom von HENDE supports and not PARKAS.

3. This was the first contact of Generals ZAKO and PARKAS by [redacted] 30. Both indicated their willingness to continue to give [redacted] reports on Hungarian emigre political events. However, we would like to raise the question with EE as to whether this kind of reporting on Hungarian military circles-in-exile is of value. All of the present subsources (General Gustav HENRIEY, Dr. Zoltan MAKRA, General Andreas ZAKO and General Ferdinand Ferenc)

CLASSIFICATION

EGMA-12115

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B26
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2-006

Chief, EE :

- 2 -

ECMA-12627

PARKAS) are well aware they are reporting to an American office, in fact it is precisely this opportunity to furnish the Americans "their side" that undoubtedly motivates them to report, with the possible exception of HENRIEY. Though production to date in this field has not been prodigious - reports conveyed in ECMA-9119, 18 December 1953; ECMA-10134, 9 March 1954; ECMA-11538, 21 June 1954; ECMA-12115 and this dispatch represent production since summer of 1953 -

(C) is beginning to regularize his contacting of these sources to once a month, which is probably the minimum necessary to induce their continued cooperation and interest. This will require two or three days a month of (C) time and will result in a greater flow of this kind of report. For that reason we would appreciate (EE)'s evaluation of past reporting and statement of current requirements, including specific guidance on the type of information you want (C) to obtain from these sources. If the present extent of (C)'s efforts to acquire Hungarian emigre political information is unwarranted, we would like to utilize the saving by having him concentrate more on developing information in the Yugoslavian field for which (C) has expressed interest. Without attempting to prejudge the issue, it is our impression, (C) included, that only HENRIEY can be said to report with any objectivity. Whether reporting from the others, i.e., the opposition to the Hungarian National Committee, has or will contribute any balancing or supplementary information of interest seems to us problematical.

4. It should also be noted that (C) has suggested HENRIEY and PARKAS as two of the leading emigre politicians he would like to inform that the (C) office is "now an official channel for the reporting of Soviet and emigre intelligence activities among the emigres". On the basis of satisfactory traces on HENRIEY (responses to ECMA-9018, 11 January 1954) it appears he would be suitable for this purpose, providing EE can advise there are no reasons by virtue of HENRIEY's prominence in the Hungarian National Committee, widely rumored in emigre circles to be American supported, which would make his use inadvisable. (C) has been requested to provide background data on PARKAS, and a trace request on him will follow shortly. However, we suggest that the question of the political reporting on Hungarian military circles-in-exile be decided on its own merits.

Enclosures:

- A - Report No. 17-8-54
- B - Report No. 18-8-54
- C - Report No. 19-8-54
- D - Report No. 20-8-54 (with encl. single cc. only to EE and COM)

24 September 1954

Distribution: 3 - EE w/2 cc. ea. encl. - DIRECT; 3 - COM w/1 cc. ea. encl.

CONFIDENTIAL

31 August 1954

Subject: Hungarian Military Circles-in-Exile

Date of Information: July - August 1954

Source: 300

Subsource: 303

Evaluation of Information: 3

On 12 August 1954 Subsource stated the following about events in Hungarian military circles-in-exile:

1. The resignation of Tibor ECKHARDT from the Comradeship Association of Hungarian Veterans (LHBK) was not prompted by personal controversies or disagreements of principle with General Andreas ZAKO. ECKHARDT supposedly came to the conviction that he could contribute much more to the Hungarian cause if he acquired US citizenship. To become a US citizen, he cannot be a member of an organization-in-exile. In order not to harm the LHBK by his resignation, he subsequently went to the LHBK congress in Chicago in April 1954, where he made a speech in favor of the LHBK. Subsource is in direct correspondence by letter with ECKHARDT and he can assure that relations between ECKHARDT and ZAKO are most cordial. Simultaneously, ECKHARDT resigned his post as head of the military section of the Hungarian National Committee (HNC).
2. Subsource states that the recent understanding reached between Generals Andreas ZAKO and Ferdinand (Ferenc) FARKAS is free of any political commitments. The agreement concerns only the elimination of past personal differences. Neither General acted in their capacity as political leaders but as private individuals. However it is intended that this personal understanding will subsequently serve as a basis for bringing about a consolidation of all Hungarian military men, for political and military eventualities. General ZAKO has reportedly now succeeded in tying to himself approximately 50 Hungarian generals-in-exile. The group around General Hugo GORTL is reportedly represented by only ten generals. General FARKAS has reportedly agreed to withdraw from political life and resign from all political offices should subsequently a "Hungarian Council of Generals-in-Exile" be created.

att R to 24WA-12627

CONFIDENTIAL 18-6-54

RI Curi

200-6-12-80

CONFIDENTIAL

3. Regarding the establishment of the "Hungarian Defense Council" by Archduke JOSEF, and also his previous recent statements and manifestos; Subsource states that JOSEF was requested as the highest-ranking officer to interfere in order to bring about peace and order in the military circles. Subsource states that obtaining the support of Archduke JOSEF was necessary to counteract the fact that the HEC had gotten Admiral HORTHY, through General Gustav HERNYI, to support General SOMYI. Subsource states that the HEBK and General ZAKO would actually be willing to follow Admiral HORTHY's leadership, should Admiral HORTHY also be entitled to decide on the composition of the political board, i.e. the HEC. However the left wing of the HEC is willing to authorize HORTHY only to command the military, and is unwilling to allow him to make political decisions. Thus, the HEBK was obliged to resort to obtaining the backing of the "oldest-in-rank personage" of the Hungarian military men in order to maintain its position.
4. Subsource also stated that the "Hungarian Defense Council" is not an imitation of and should not be confounded with the "Supreme Defense Council" provided for in the Hungarian military law of 1939, P/II - Para 3, Article 3.
5. Concerning the article published in Hunaria on 1 August 1954, which, on the basis of excerpts from the diary of Hungarian General PARAGHO, accused General HERNYI of having known about the secret peace negotiations with the Soviets, Subsource states that the article is due to the initiative of Dr. Zoltan MAIRA, editor of Hunaria. When asked as to how Dr. MAIRA had gained this detailed knowledge of PARAGHO's diary, Subsource stated that MAIRA was a very close friend of PARAGHO's and had learned these details directly from him before MAIRA's flight from Hungary in 1949. (1)
6. Subsource emphatically denied the rumor circulating in the Hungarian emigration that Dr. MAIRA had temporarily resigned as editor-in-chief of Hunaria. Subsource states MAIRA merely turned the administrative details over to someone else. Subsource also stated that Dr. MAIRA is complaining about attempts made in Hungarian circles to label him a Communist or anti-US in order to render him harmless to the HEC.
- (1) Source comment: The purpose of the article in Hunaria was to make General HERNYI unacceptable in Germany. It is anticipated that German circles of today will consider and condemn Hungarian peace negotiations with the Soviets in 1944 as a betrayal of German-Hungarian comradeship-in-arms and not as a withdrawal from the alliance with Nazis. Once HERNYI should be branded as a person cognizant of these negotiations, it would be considered a gross lack of diplomatic tact by the HEC to assign HERNYI as the HEC Hungarian representative in

CONFIDENTIAL

Germany. Subsource states Dr. MAYRA composed the article in such a manner as to allow no way out for General HENRYEY. HENRYEY must either admit he knew about the negotiations, making him impossible in Germany, or he must deny it and thus criticize HORTHY to the extent that HORTHY made foreign-policy decisions without informing his Foreign Minister. Judging from HENRYEY's devotion to HORTHY Subsource does not believe that HENRYEY will want to so criticize the Admiral.